


THE BRODSKY LAW FIRM, PL

RICHARD E. BRODSKY, ATTORNEY AT LAW

September 3, 2014

By fax to (212) 805-6382

Honorable Victor Marrero
United States District Judge
Daniel Patrick Moynihan U.S. Courthouse
500 Pearl Street
New York, New York 10007-1312



**Re: *Anwar, et al. v. Fairfield Greenwich Limited, et al.,
09-cv-118 (VM) (THK)
SC Cases***

Dear Judge Marrero:

I write as the Liaison Counsel for, and on behalf of, the SC Plaintiffs ("SC Plaintiffs") in the Standard Chartered Cases.

I wish to bring to the Court's attention differences between two letter endorsements issued by this Court concerning the same matter.

On July 9, 2014, the undersigned counsel wrote the Court to request approval of an agreement between the SC Plaintiffs and the SC Defendants with regard to the scheduling of the Defendants' intended letter to the Court requesting a pre-motion conference about the filing of a summary judgment motion. The letter recited the parties' agreement to the Defendants' writing the Court by August 29, 2014 and the Plaintiffs' responding by September 12, 2014 in a letter of up to ten pages. The Court endorsed the letter as follows: "Request granted. The timing for the parties' pre-motion conference letter is approved as set forth above." (DE 1285, 7/10/14)

The SC Defendants submitted their letter on August 29, 2014. The Court endorsed the letter as follows: "SCB litigation plaintiffs are directed to respond by 9-7-14, by letter not to exceed three (3) pages, to the matter set forth above by SCB defendants." (DE 1314, 9/3/14)

We respectfully request that this Court clarify whether the SC Plaintiffs' letter is due September 7, 2014¹ and whether the Court will permit that letter to be up to ten pages. We intend to set forth in summary fashion the reasons that the SC Defendants should not be permitted to file for summary judgment. We believe that the Court would benefit from the more extended discussion that will be enabled in a letter of up to ten pages. If, on the other hand, the Court, by its July 10, 2014 endorsement, did not intend to convey approval of a letter of up to ten pages, or

¹September 7 is a Sunday, so we interpret the Court's endorsement of the SC Defendants' August 29 letter as establishing a September 8, 2014 deadline.


Hon. Victor Marrero
September 3, 2014
Page 2

if the Court has changed its mind, we would nevertheless appreciate the opportunity to have until the time approved in the July 9, 2014 letter (September 12, 2014), and request approval of a letter in excess of three pages but with a lower limit than ten pages, as the Court shall see fit.

We appreciate the Court's attention to this request.


Sincerely yours,

The Brodsky Law Firm, PL



Richard E. Brodsky

cc: SC Plaintiffs' Counsel
SC Defendants' Counsel

| | |
|--|--|
| <i>Request GRANTED. The Court's</i> | |
| <i>memo-enforced Order dated</i> | |
| <i>9-3-14 is modified to extend the</i> | |
| <i>date by which plaintiffs herein may</i> | |
| <i>respond to 9-12-14 and the page</i> | |
| <i>limitation enlarged to 10 pages.</i> | |
| SO ORDERED: | |
| <i>9-4-14</i> |  |
| DATE | VICTOR MARRERO, U.S.D.J. |